



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

or attributing to his pen, things which were never uttered by the one nor written by the other. Leo never asserted that there was any defect in the Council of Chalcedon's proceedings because done contrary to his authority; but because these things had been done, whether by a coerced consent or not, contrary to the decrees of the previous Council of Nice. Leo never asserted that the 28th canon of Chalcedon stated falsehood as to the origin of the precedence of Rome, or the grounds on which it had enjoyed that precedence. But Binius thinks that Pope Leo ought to have done so, and therefore boldly asserts that he did so, and that on a ground which Leo never could have ventured on, viz., that the commencement of the 6th canon of Nice itself proved that the Church of Rome obtained her "primacy" neither from Councils nor Emperors, but from Christ Himself! Had Pope Leo relied on this asserted commencement of the 6th canon of Nice, the answer would have been a very simple one—that no extant copy of the canons of Nice had any such commencement, and that, when the Papal Legates attempted to read their heading to the said canon, as part of the canon, they were met at once by the Secretary of the Council at Chalcedon reading the canon, simply as it was passed at Nice, without any such prefix or addition.

It remains only for us briefly to show how unavailing were all Pope Leo's exertions, or those of his successors, Popes Felix and Gelasius, either to persuade the Imperial powers to annul, or even subsequent Popes to refuse their consent to, the new privileges thus conferred on the Patriarch of Constantinople by the General Councils of Constantinople and Chalcedon.

The Emperor Justinian ascended the throne of the Cæsars A.D. 527, and by the 131st of his Novels, or additions to the civil law, chapters 1 and 2, concerning ecclesiastical titles and privileges, it is thus enacted:—

Chap. I.—We ordain that the holy ecclesiastical rules which were established or ratified by the four holy Councils shall obtain the force of laws. We mean the Council of Nice of 318, the Council of Constantinople of 150 Fathers, that of Ephesus, in which Nestorius was condemned, and that of Chalcedon, in which Eutyches was anathematized. For we accept the decrees of the aforesaid four synods as if they were in the Holy Scriptures, and will have them observed as laws.

Chap. II.—We in like manner ordain, according to their definitions, that the most holy Pope of the elder Rome is the first of all priests; but that the most blessed Archbishop of Constantinople (New Rome) has the second place after the holy Apostolic See of the elder Rome, and is to be preferred to all other Sees.

Thus was the 28th canon of Chalcedon recognised among the laws of the empire.

It only remains to show how it was adopted by subsequent Councils and Popes.

The first which we have met with was the Quinisext Council in A.D. 681, which confirmed the decrees of Chalcedon, without excepting any of them,³ and the precedence of Constantinople was again recognized at the 4th Council of Lateran, under Pope Innocent III. (when Frederick II. was Emperor), A.D. 1215.⁴

But the most decisive of all was that of the Council of Florence, under Pope Eugenius IV., A.D. 1439, which in terms renewed the order handed down to them in the canons, viz., that the Patriarch of Constantinople should be second after the holy Roman Pontiff, that the Patriarch of Alexandria should be third, Antioch the fourth, and Jerusalem the fifth, saving all their laws and privileges.⁵

We have now given our readers as clear a notion as we could in a short compass of the ineffectual struggle made against the 28th canon of Chalcedon by Pope Leo, which was followed up by some of his successors, and of the reluctant assent tardily given to it in after times by both Popes and Councils. There was, indeed, but one real ground on which it ever was opposed, though that was one which it would not have done for the Popes to have disclosed prematurely—namely, that it was directly against the notion (which, doubtless, Pope Leo I. and his successors had in their minds, though at that period the design was unknown and unsuspected by the rest of Christendom) that their central position in the ancient capital of the world, and acknowledged precedence as such, might, judiciously managed, be expanded into an ecclesiastical supremacy, which, some centuries later, amid the decline of the Empire, it actually became.

HOW THE FATHERS ARE TREATED IN THE CHURCH OF ROME.—No. II.

ST. CHRYSOSTOM.

ONE of the maxims, the application of which the advocates of the Church of Rome find most inconvenient in practice, is the maxim that *truth must be always the same*. From this it would follow, that if the Church of Rome teaches true doctrines now, we ought to find the same doctrines taught

in every preceding age of the Church, up to the time of the Apostles themselves. But it turns out, that when we proceed to examine, we find not a word in the Bible, or in the early Fathers, concerning some of the doctrines on which Roman Catholics now lay most stress; but, on the contrary, we find the teaching of that primitive Church, to all appearance at least, the direct contrary of modern Roman Catholic teaching. To solve this difficulty, some clever and courageous modern advocates of Romanism have started a theory that truth need not be always the same; but, unfortunately, this theory was not invented until after the Church of Rome had repeatedly committed herself to the statement that she taught nothing new—nothing that the Church did not teach and receive from the beginning. And the most common way by which she has endeavoured to escape the practical inconvenience arising from the difference between ancient and modern teaching is by keeping her people as much as possible from the knowledge of the ancient teaching. We all know with how little favour Bible-reading is regarded by Roman Catholics; and one of the rules of the committee appointed under the Council of Trent for the prohibiting of dangerous books particularly condemns translations of the Bible, as being likely to do more harm than good to those who use them. And Protestants, too, have found the wisdom of using the circulation of the Scriptures as one of their principal weapons against Romanism, being persuaded that the peculiar tenets of that Church cannot continue to be believed in by any who take the trouble to compare them with the teaching of the Bible. It is fortunate for the Church of Rome that the writings of the Fathers occupy some scores of bulky volumes, and that great part of them are such as would not interest readers of the present day; for we have no doubt that it would be nearly as mischievous to the Church of Rome if her people were extensively to compare her teaching with that of the Fathers of the first three or four centuries as if they were to compare it with the Bible. And if Protestants were to form societies for the gratuitous circulation of the Fathers among Roman Catholics, we should find the priests oppose them as angrily as they have done the Bible societies. The fact is, that the priests would like both the Bible and the Fathers if they would only speak on their side, but they cannot venture to trust them to speak with perfect freedom. They treat them as some criminals have been treated who have been anxious to address the people on the scaffold, and who have obtained permission to speak as long as they did not touch on any topic objectionable to the ruling powers, but who were forcibly silenced the moment that they introduced any of these dangerous subjects. In an article in our last number, we have given some account of the general policy of the Church of Rome with respect to the Fathers, and we showed that there was good reason for the distrust which Protestants generally feel as to the fair dealing of the heads of the Roman Catholic Church, where the interests of their Church are concerned. Suppose, for instance, that the librarians of the Vatican were to discover there unpublished writings of some venerable Father, containing strong testimony against the doctrines or practice of their Church: in such a case what would they be likely to do? Protestants would strongly suspect that in such a case the interests of the Church would be considered first, and the interests of truth second—that if the manuscript were not destroyed or altered, it would, at least, be quietly cushioned, and nothing would be heard about it. The Roman Catholic authorities have been always more anxious to make the books they circulate conformable to the doctrine approved by their Church than to make them be exactly what their authors intended them to be.

However, it is now time to leave reasoning on the avowed principles of Roman Catholic authorities, and speculating on what they would be likely to do, and to give some instances of what they have actually done. In the present article we shall give a historical sketch of the adventures of a remarkable epistle ascribed to St. Chrysostom.

One of the leading points of difference between Protestants and Roman Catholics is the question of the Eucharist, and the doctrine of Transubstantiation, asserted by the latter and denied by the former. If we try to find out with which side any ancient Father agrees, there is one difficulty, arising from the fact that all parties use very much the same language. All parties agree in describing in the loftiest words the benefits received by the faithful partaker of that holy sacrament. The catechism of the Church of England asserts that the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper; and language no less strong is freely employed by all her eminent divines. In fact, since our Lord Himself, when delivering that sacred food, said, "This is my body," "This is my blood," no one who acknowledges His authority can hesitate to use similar language; and the only difference that can exist between Christians is as to the sense in which that language is to be understood. It is of no use, then, to bring forward from the Fathers, as some Roman Catholics do, passages in which similar language is employed, and to suppose that they prove the doctrine of Transubstantiation, when language just as strong is used by members of the Church of England. The whole question is as to the meaning of the language. We hold that the means by which the body of our Lord is received is *faith*. We deny that a conversion takes place indepen-

dently of the faith of the recipients; such that even a dog or mouse who should consume the consecrated elements would take the body of our Lord. We reject the carnal and literal meaning put upon our Lord's words by those who first heard Him and which He Himself condemned. "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." Now, there is one very decisive test, whether the ancient Fathers agreed with us on this point or whether they held Romish doctrine. The scholastic divines, who invented the theory of Transubstantiation, had the sagacity to see that in the gross literal sense the consecrated elements could not be two things at a time. If they were the body and blood of our Lord, they must cease to be bread and wine. Accordingly, they teach that when the words of consecration are spoken, the substance of the bread and wine are absolutely and altogether annihilated. This is the doctrine which is formally adopted by the Church of Rome; sanctioned by her Councils; taught in her catechisms, and believed by her people. It is sufficient, then, to examine, did the Fathers believe that the substance of bread and wine remained in the elements of the Eucharist after consecration. If they did it is evident that they did not hold Roman Catholic doctrine, and that no matter what language they may use in speaking of the dignity of that sacrament, still they did not hold the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

At the time of the Reformation there was warm controversy as to the sentiments of the Fathers on all the disputed points between the Church of Rome and the Reformers, and, of course, the subject of Transubstantiation then received peculiar attention. Among other testimonies the Reformer, Peter Martyr, in a disputation with Bishop Gardiner, alleged the following passage from a then unpublished epistle of St. Chrysostom to the monk Casarius.

"Now, as before the bread is sanctified we call it bread; but when the divine grace sanctifies it through the mediation of the priest, it is freed from the name of bread, and is worthy to be called the Lord's body, although the nature of bread remains in it."⁶

In this passage we are taught expressly that though St. Chrysostom scruples not to call the elements after consecration by the name of those things which they represent, he calls them so not because he believes them to have lost their original nature, and to have ceased to be what they were, but because being hallowed to a new and higher purpose they may be called that which they are the means of communicating. These words, in which the doctrine of Transubstantiation is contradicted in terms, caused no small perplexity to the Roman Catholic divines of the day, and they were beginning to take some pains to see how they could be reconciled with the teaching of their Church, when the death of Edward the Sixth and the accession of Queen Mary enabled them to find a different reply. Peter Martyr's manuscript copy of this passage from St. Chrysostom had been lodged in Archbishop Cranmer's library, which, under Mary's reign, fell into the hands of his theological opponents. If Protestants have any prejudices as to the manner in which Roman Catholics would be likely to treat an ancient document which told against them, we are sorry that this history does not afford us the means of refuting those prejudices. Peter Martyr's transcript from St. Chrysostom was soon not forthcoming. No tidings could be had of this valuable record of antiquity, and by this time Martyr was dead, and there were no means of ascertaining from what authority he had made his transcription. The Roman Catholic controversialists were now on velvet, and when this passage from St. Chrysostom was alleged against them in controversy, they boldly set it aside as an impudent forgery of Peter Martyr. In the process of years, however, a new light was thrown on the matter. A very learned and honest French Roman Catholic, Emeric Bigot, in the course of his literary travels, happened to come across the very manuscript from which, in all probability, Peter Martyr had made his copy; for Peter Martyr was a Florentine, and the manuscript found by Bigot was discovered in a Dominican monastery at Florence. Bigot carefully transcribed the epistle, and prepared it for publication, together with Palladius's life of St. Chrysostom and some other ancient writings till then unpublished. The work was duly printed, but before it was presented to the public an unexpected impediment arose. The literary censors of the Sorbonne learned with great alarm this part of the contents of Bigot's forthcoming work. They could not see without apprehension Peter Martyr cleared from the charge of forgery, and the reformers justifying their opposition to Transubstantiation by the authority of one of the most venerated Fathers of the Church. To avoid these dangerous consequences, Bigot was compelled by the King's authority to cancel all this dangerous part of his work. Such a change after the book had been all printed was rather a troublesome one to make, and the absence of the pages, numbered 236-245, remains as perpetual evidence of the mutilation of the volume. It is no harm to tell at full length the various changes which the omission of this epistle involved, by which it will be seen

What a tangled web we weave,
When first we practice to deceive.

In the first place, as the title page contained a list of the different treatises contained in the volume, it was necessary to cancel the old title page, and print a new

³ Corpus Juris Civilis, Authentica seu Novella, p. 262. Lugdun.³ 1666.

⁴ See Labbe and Cœsa. tom. vi., p. 1141.

⁵ Labbe and Cœsa. tom. xl. pt. i., p. 158.

⁶ "Removantes inasper ordinem traditionis in canonicis, ceterosque venerabilium patriarcharum, et patriarcharum Constantinopolitanorum sententias ac post multos annos Romanorum pontificum, tertius vero Alexandrinus, quartus antem Antiochenus, et quintus Hierosolymitanus, salva videlicet privilegia omnibus et juribus eorum."—Labbe and Cœsa. tom. xiii., p. 1167-8.

one. The next thing to be done was to strike out the table of contents which follows the dedicatory epistle, and to print a new one. And here occur some marks of confusion; for the treatise before the omitted epistle commencing p. 229, the next following is marked p. 225. We cannot say whether this is a mere misprint for 245, or whether it was, as Mr. Mendham supposes, designed to raise a suspicion as to the accuracy of the printers, and so enable some of the other strange things in these volumes to escape notice. The next part that had to be cut out was a portion of the preface in which Bigot had given an account of this epistle of Chrysostom, and of the manner in which he had found it. The preface is not paged, but the fraud may be traced by the printers' signatures at the bottom of the pages, one leaf being substituted for two marked with the signatures *ij*, *i ij*. Mr. Mendham describes a curious circumstance by which the fraud in his copy is exposed. It would naturally happen that the leaves which were printed in order to be substituted for the matter cut out would be fresher than the rest, and would run the risk of being, what is called, *set off* upon the next page, if placed in contact too early with it. Now in Mr. Mendham's copy this very thing has occurred, and the substituted leaf is set off, but not upon the pages before and after, as would be the case if the impression had taken place during the binding of the volume. It is set off upon two other leaves, also newly substituted, but which occur in quite different places in the bound volume, though when the work lay in sheets, the newly printed sheets were naturally placed together. We now come to the epistle itself. It originally commenced p. 236, and finished p. 244. When it was left out, since p. 236 was the second side of a leaf it became necessary to print this leaf over again, in order to retain the conclusion of the treatise immediately preceding. And it was thought advisable to make *here* the necessary advance of the pages, as being the place where it might have the best chance of escaping notice. The last page but one being 234, the careless printer mistakes the middle number, and prints the new page 245, while there is nothing to excite suspicion of any designed alteration, since this new page reads quite consecutively to that before it. Something else had to be done, however; for though the omission of the ten pages had been now smoothed over, there was still an awkwardness about the signatures at the bottom of the sheets, the next treatise commencing with the signature *Hh ij*, the signatures *Hh* and *Hhij* being in the cancelled matter. To cover this over, a new leaf is printed, containing nothing but a general title of what follows, and bearing the signature *Hh*, so that one who did not look very closely might easily suppose all to be right. Some other changes had to be made in the index at the end of the volume, but we need not go into further details, as we have sufficiently shown the pains that were taken to silence poor St. Chrysostom. Unfortunately, so much pains were not rewarded with the success they deserved; for M. Bigot, who was an honest man, had made no secret of his discovery, but had communicated it several years before to many of his literary friends. He had, for instance, advised one of his Roman Catholic friends who was engaged in controversy with the Protestant Claude, when pressed with this passage, not to defend himself, as Cardinal Perron had done, by accusing Martyr of forgery, assuring him that this defence was not tenable. The fact of Bigot's discovery had been publicly announced about ten years before, and very many had been informed that this long-looked for epistle was to appear in Bigot's forthcoming volume. Great, then, was the disappointment when it was sought there in vain, and the ugly gap of ten pages could not long escape observation. Within less than two years the whole story was exposed by Peter Allix in an expostulation prefixed to a work of Anastasius edited by him. And within two or three years more the exposure was made thoroughly complete by Archbishop Wake, who had in some way got hold of the cancelled leaves of Bigot's edition, and published the whole, carefully marking the line and page where they had originally stood in Bigot's edition before its mutilation. The epistle had also been published by Stephen Le Moine, and it was published again with Bigot's preface by Basnage at Rotterdam. So much publicity was thus given to the epistle within a couple of years, that it was found hopeless to suppress it, and in another year or two the Jesuit Hardouin published it again, and, courageously endeavoured to show that it contained nothing but good orthodox Roman Catholic doctrine. The Benedictine editors also include it in their edition of Chrysostom's works, though apparently not feeling very confident in the success of Hardouin's vindication, they think it better to have two strings to their bow, and make a fight in defence of the position that the epistle was not written by St. Chrysostom. It is true that we have all the reasons for believing it to be St. Chrysostom's that we have for attributing to him many others of the works which bear his name, viz., that the manuscript ascribes the work to him, and that the epistle to Cæsarius is quoted as Chrysostom's by several ancient authors; nor would it probably have entered into the heads of the editors to deny its having sprung from Chrysostom, if it had not been for the very

unpleasant doctrine which he teaches. It would lengthen this article too much if we were here to proceed to a discussion of the authorship of the epistle, and the inferences to be drawn as to the writer's doctrine; but we hope to devote an article next month to this subject. Meanwhile, we have given a specimen how Roman Catholic divines try to muzzle a Father when he attempts to say anything they don't like.

THE INDELIBLE CHARACTER OF HOLY ORDERS. No. II.

In our last number we proposed the question, whether the ministry instituted by Christ in His Church be "an office" to be fulfilled, or whether it consist in an operation or indelible "character" or mark produced by ordination in the soul of the ordained.

There are other important questions respecting that ministry, but we selected this question for consideration because it is most important in itself, and because it is a key to the solution of other questions.

If the ministry be an office which Christ has given to man to perform, as Christ has directed, then ministers are to be regarded according as they perform their office, and are to be followed as they follow Christ. But if the power of orders is valid, even when used in opposition to God Himself, then ministers will be obeyed and followed, even when they abuse their office, and pervert it to hinder the work of Christ.

We cannot now stop to justify further our selection of "The indelible character of Holy Orders" as our present subject: we will repeat the statement of Archbishop Devoti, and then proceed to contrast with it the laws and canons of the Church for 1200 years.

Devoti says—"Ordination is valid by whatever Bishop it may be granted, who has the power annexed to character. Therefore ordinations are valid and firm (*ratæ, firmæ sunt*) though made by a Bishop who is a heretic, a schismatic, excommunicated, suspended, even by one who has renounced at once his place and dignity;" and this is held by Roman Catholics to be the proper consequence of the decrees of the Council of Trent on Holy Orders.

We proceed now to show what ancient Fathers, Popes, and Councils thought of this matter.

The famous case of Novatian, in the year 251, affords the earliest decision we can find of this question.

Fabian, Bishop of Rome, having died, Cornelius was afterwards elected and consecrated. Novatian was afterwards consecrated Bishop of Rome by three canonical Bishops, holding sees in Italy. Upon this St. Cyprian wrote, "that he cannot have ecclesiastical ordination who does not hold the unity of the Church . . . and since after the first there cannot be a second, whoever is made after the one who alone ought to be, he is now not the second, but none. . . . Novatian is not a Bishop."

No judgment ever had greater weight in the Church than this. It was an acknowledged maxim of Church law for more than ten centuries after. We have copied it from the Decretum of Gratian, which from 1152 to the Reformation, and long after, was the great authority in the Latin Church. Caus. VII, 91 c. 5 and 6.

Yet, according to Devoti, the ordination of Novatian was valid, and he had the order of a Bishop, and power to exercise it.

The first GENERAL COUNCIL (Nice) re-affirmed the principle that Cyprian had laid down. "That is quite clear, that if any one is made a Bishop without the consent of the metropolitan, this great Synod determines that he ought not to be a Bishop."

The 9th canon of Nice declares that if any were ordained without due examination, and have confessed "that men acting on motives contrary to the canons laid hands on them (in ordination), the canon does not admit such; for the Catholic Church does not defend what is blameable."

The 10th canon of Nice orders that if any of those who have fallen back to idolatry should be ordained through the ignorance or dissimulation of the ordainers, when it was known, they should be "wiped out" of the list of the clergy (*καθαίρονται*).

The 16th canon of Nice declares that if a clergyman, subject to one Bishop, shall be ordained (to a higher order) by another Bishop, such ordination shall be void;—"ordinationis hujus modi irrita erit." (*ἀκυροῦς ἐστὶν ἡ χειροτονία*).

The 18th canon of Antioch provides, that if a Bishop go to another diocese to ordain, unasked, such ordinations shall be void—"irrita."—*ἀκυρα*.

By the 19th canon of Antioch, if a Bishop be ordained without the Bishops of the province, "such ordination

shall have no force," (*non valere ordinationem*)—*μηδὲ λαμβάνει τὴν χειροτονίαν*.

This was to prevent surreptitious hole-and-corner ordinations—not to invalidate what might be necessary in times of persecution.

The second GENERAL COUNCIL (Constantinople) affords a remarkable and decisive case:

The See of Constantinople was vacant; Gregory Nazianzen was elected; he renounced the office on account of the opposition got up against him. Nectarius was then elected; but the party who opposed Gregory attempted irregularly to intrude Maximus Cynicus, an Egyptian philosopher, into that see. Sozomen, the ecclesiastical historian, thus relates the fact of his ordination:—"The Bishops who had come (to the Council) from Egypt, by a stealthy ordination, had consecrated him Bishop of the city of Constantinople."

The fact is clear that Maximus was consecrated by Bishops who had valid episcopal orders themselves; but who acted wrong in so consecrating him. The Church of Rome now holds that one so consecrated is a Bishop indeed, and that those ordained by him are priests, and can never cease to be priests, and that their acts are necessarily valid. But let us see what was the decision of the GENERAL COUNCIL of Constantinople in their 4th canon.

"Concerning Maximus Cynicus, and the disorder committed respecting him in Constantinople; that Maximus neither became nor is a Bishop, nor are those by him ordained in any rank of the clergy; all things, both those done concerning him and those done by him, being invalidated."

How little notion had this General Council of the "indelible character" and the necessary effect of ordination when performed by those who have "the power of order!" They clearly thought that ordination conferred by Bishops in the communion of the Church was worth nothing, and conferred nothing, and was, in fact, wholly void and ineffectual, when used contrary to the purpose for which Christ established a ministry in the Church.

The 1st canon of the THIRD GENERAL COUNCIL (Ephesus) pronounces any Archbishop who holds the doctrine of Celestius (denying the necessity of the Grace of God) to be deprived of his power as Metropolitan, "thenceforward excluded by the Synod from all ecclesiastical communion, and remaining without the power of effecting anything." (*ἀνεκκλητος ὑπάρχων*).—Justell. et Voell. 59.

Canon 2 declares that those Bishops who adhere to the doctrines of Celestius or Nestorius are "wholly outside of the Priesthood" (*ἀλλοτριούς εἶναι τῆς ὑπερσύνης*).—Justell. et Voell. 59.

The FOURTH GENERAL COUNCIL (Chalcedon), in its 6th canon, forbids that any person should be ordained who was not first nominated or appointed to some church in which he should officiate, and "the Holy Synod has decreed to hold such ordination of no effect." (*ἀκυρον*).—Justell. et Voell. p. 63.

Space utterly fails us to give all the various proofs we have collected. We have, therefore, confined ourselves to give a few of the proofs from each of those FOUR GENERAL COUNCILS which Pope Gregory the Great declared that he held, as he did the four Gospels.

Clearly the Fathers of those Councils were utterly ignorant of the monstrous doctrine that orders given in heresy, in schism, in opposition to the purpose of God, and to the laws of the Church, were yet of necessity valid if given by Bishops, who themselves had once received the power of order. Clearly they thought that orders given even by those who had the power of orders, but who used it to defeat the object of the ministry, were utterly invalid, and should be declared by the Church so to be. Clearly the Fathers of these great General Councils were not "Roman Catholics" in the modern sense, as respects holding the modern doctrine of Rome about the "Sacrament of order."

We must now leave the early ages, and show how long the primitive doctrine remained in the Church, and how late it was before the modern doctrine of the "indelible character," and its "necessary effect," came to be established in the Church of Rome itself.

We have already shown that the doctrine of St. Cyprian held its place in the Decretum of Gratian, in the twelfth and following centuries; we will give some further passages from the Decretum.

The Decretum contains a Decree of Pope Nicholas II., A.D. 1059, by which decree the election of Popes was governed; its authority, therefore, cannot be questioned. In that decree Pope Nicholas II. quotes, as undeniable, from Pope Leo I., the following principles:—"No reason permits that they should be reckoned among Bishops who have neither been elected by the clergy, nor asked for by the people, nor consecrated by the Comprovincial Bishops,

* The same, 47.

* Episcopi qui ex Egypto adveniant, furtiva ordinatione episcopum Constantinopolitanæ urbis sacraverant."—Sozomen Hist. Eccl. Lib. vi. c. 9.

† Περὶ Μαξίμου τοῦ κυνικοῦ, καὶ τὰς κατ' αὐτὸν ἀταξίας τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει γενομένης: ὥς μήτε Μαξίμον ἐπίσκοπον ἢ γενέσθαι ἢ εἶναι, μήτε τοὺς παρ' αὐτὸν χειροτονηθέντας ἐν οὐλοῦντοτε βαθμῶ ἐκλήρω, παντῶν καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτοὺς καὶ τῶν παρ' αὐτοὺς γενομένων ἀκυροῦντων.—4th Canon, C.P. Bib. Justell. et Voell. 56.